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Decisions concerning salary, promotions, tenure, and other rewards, will be based on evaluations of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service during the previous calendar year. Performance is evaluated as **Significantly Exceeds Merit Expectation** (3 points), **Exceeds Merit Expectation** (2 points), **Meets Merit Expectation** (1 point), or **Does Not Meet Merit Expectation** (0 points) for the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

The Department of Psychology reserves the right to modify the merit policy for distribution of one-time bonuses that will not lead to permanent increases in salary.

#### Annual Review

All faculty members will submit an Annual Review Report for Faculty after each calendar year, by February 1. In this report, faculty members will document their professional activities for the previous calendar year. All faculty (except for per-course faculty) are required to provide descriptions of their activities in all three areas: teaching, scholarly activities, and service. Per-course faculty will complete the Annual Review Report for only the relevant teaching activities. The Faculty Review Committee (FRC) will make performance evaluation recommendations to the Chair based on departmentally approved criteria outlined below.

1. Teaching. Evaluation of teaching performance will normally involve an inspection of the faculty member’s teaching portfolio, which may include such items as syllabi and student evaluations (available from the departmental office) and other documentation. Documentation normally should include the following:

A. Syllabi for courses taught at Texas State University during the period being reviewed. Syllabi for all courses must be consistent with University policies as follows: (a) each syllabus must include the required components 13.01a-13.01j detailed in AA/PPS 02.03.01 Conduct and Planning of Courses, (b) instructors must list contact hours that are consistent with the Psychology Department Contact Hours policy, (c) final exams must be held according to the published final exam schedule, and (d) WI courses must have at least 65% of the grade based on written work that includes a paper of at least 500 words. The Chair of the Psychology Department will assign either a faculty or staff member to provide the FRC and Chair with a report for each faculty member, indicating any cases of inconsistency with these University policies.

B. Anonymous student evaluations of teaching effectiveness completed by students enrolled in courses taught during that year. The Department will provide the FRC and Chair with a list of faculty members’ mean summary evaluation ratings from the departmental evaluation form for the previous calendar year. Specifically, for each course section taught by the faculty member that year, a section mean evaluation rating from items 1-16 (about both the instructor and course) will be computed, and then these section mean ratings will be averaged for a single value of overall teaching effectiveness based on student evaluations. Effective teaching will be evident with a mean of 4, representing that on average, the students agreed that the instructor was prepared, used class time effectively, and so on. Faculty with mean summary ratings below 4 may be considered to have not met merit expectations, unless the faculty member provides other documentation (from the list below) demonstrating teaching effectiveness and commitment to self-development.

C. Development of a new course that the faculty member is teaching for the first time (i.e., a new prep that may or may not be a new course for the Department).The faculty member will receive credit to be considered towards merit for the semester that the course is first taught (not when it is proposed and/or prepared), to ensure that credit is not received twice for the work. Revision of existing courses for study abroad or a distance-based format will be eligible for merit consideration.

D. Direction of major student projects, including students who are completing honors or masters theses, students who are completing dissertations, students who are enrolled in the Independent Study course (and the Internship course in the special case that faculty are not compensated for teaching the course due to low enrollment; faculty must make note of such a case in the annual report), students who have a contract with the faculty member to complete additional assignments in a course for honors credit, and students who are conducting research on a volunteer basis rather than for course credit. In the latter two cases, the faculty member should provide a description of his or her tasks and time commitment to the student. Also note that the faculty member should receive credit to be considered towards merit only for the semester that the student project has been successfully defended or completed, to ensure that credit is not received twice for the work.

E. Honors or recognition received for teaching effectiveness, including (in order of importance) the teaching awards granted by the University and College of Liberal Arts, recognition of teaching by organizations outside of the University, and recognition by a student organization (e.g., nomination as a favorite professor by Alpha Chi National Honor Society).

F. Professional-development activities including attendance at professional development workshops, as well as completion of continuing education (CE) coursework and submission of teaching grants. When listing a workshop or CE course, the faculty member should include the hours of the event. If the time commitment is not specified, the FRC and Chair will assume that the workshop or course was only 1 hour in duration. Up to 6 professional development hours tied to diversity (based on race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, veterans’ status, sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression) may count double (up to 12 hours). Faculty should not list the same workshop or course in multiple areas (e.g., both teaching and scholarship). Note that Clinical Faculty should include these professional development activities in the scholarship section of the annual report, per AA/PPS 04.01.22 Clinical Faculty Appointments.

G. Publication of a textbook or study guide. Publications that have an ISBN (i.e., intended for wide dissemination) will be counted more than those without an ISBN (i.e., intended for local use). The faculty member will receive credit to be considered towards merit for the semester that the book is published, to ensure that credit is not received twice for the work.

H. Other documentation the faculty member wishes to submit. Examples are awards received by students who the faculty mentored, and the inclusion of student letters recognizing the faculty member’s contribution to their academic careers. Note that teaching additional courses above the required minimum, as well as teaching courses in the summer, will not be counted towards additional merit consideration; this does not preclude merit consideration for the development of new courses in the summer. One exception may be taking over a course in the middle of the semester for a faculty member going on family or medical leave, as this special circumstance may be considered going above and beyond to help the Department. This other documentation and justification of additional merit should be described by the faculty member in the comment boxes and/or uploaded documents.

In an effort to be as objective and fair as possible, the FRC will use the rubric in Appendix A for determining the merit points in teaching for each faculty member. Faculty members should submit the completed rubric along with their annual report.

1. Scholarly Activity. Scholarly output will be evaluated on its quantity, the level of authorship, its quality, and its contributions to the discipline. Regarding authorship, being a first or primary author is worth more than being a co-author. In evaluating the value of a scholarly contribution, impact factors, such as the prestige of the outlet, citation rates, and general circulation should be considered. Note that faculty will receive merit credit only once for a given item. For publications, faculty will receive merit credit for the year that the work is officially published with complete citation information, or (at the faculty member’s request) is published online early and has been assigned a doi. For funded multi-year grants, faculty will receive merit credit for the year that the grant is first awarded, given that these larger grants will be worth more in merit than the smaller one-year grants. Documentation normally should include the following:

A. Refereed publications (submitted electronically) in academic journals, books, and book chapters, as well as funded external grants. For refereed books and book chapters, the faculty member must provide documentation of the peer-reviewing (e.g., a document with the faculty member’s responses to the peer comments). If no evidence is provided, the book or book chapter will be treated as non-refereed.

B. Non-refereed publications (submitted electronically) in academic journals, books, book chapters, monographs, and book reviews.

C. Internally funded grants, honors or recognition received for scholarship, and papers published in conference proceedings. Note that if these conference papers are refereed and made available publicly outside of the conference (e.g., published in a special issue of a journal produced by the conference’s organization), then they may be included in Part A with other refereed publications.

D. Oral presentations at state, regional, national, or international professional conventions, and non-funded grants.

E. Poster presentations at conventions, grant reports, and other unpublished reports.

F. Presentation of one’s own research at a local venue (e.g., brown bag presentation, co-author on a paper presented at the undergraduate or graduate research conference on campus). Note that local non-research presentations (e.g., guest lecture in a colleague’s class on a topic such as clinical psychology, talk for a student organization on a topic such as graduate school) belong in the service section of the annual report.

G. Other documentation the faculty member wishes to submit. Some examples include notes about authorship credit, doing a significantly greater amount of work than is typical on a second edition of a book, publishing an article with five or more studies that is well beyond the norm, and receiving an exceptionally large grant, or receiving a prestigious invitation to make a presentation. This other documentation and justification of additional merit should be described by the faculty member in the comment boxes and/or uploaded documents.

Per AA/PPS 04.01.20 and the Department of Psychology’s Faculty Workload Policy, scholarship expectations differ by faculty rank, which should be considered in assigning merit ratings for this category.

*Tenure-track faculty* and *tenured faculty*, for the purpose of meeting merit expectations in this category, are expected to produce at least one first-authored refereed publication, two co-authored refereed publications, or a large (50K+) funded grant proposal during a two-year period. Thus, they must show progress each year toward meeting this objective.

*The Chair*, by necessity, focuses primarily on administrative duties, so expectations for scholarship should be adjusted accordingly. Thus, the Chair, like tenured faculty on Option A, is expected to have at least one conference presentation or the equivalent each year.

*Lecturers* and *Senior Lecturers* have no scholarship expectations or requirements beyond maintaining one’s professional development by staying current in the field. The FRC and Chair will assume that all faculty read books and articles to stay current in the field, and thus, lecturers will receive a minimal rating of meeting merit expectations for this category. Any scholarly activity, as indicated in the list of documentation above, could then be rewarded with a rating of exceeding merit expectations.

*Clinical Faculty*, per AA/PPS 04.01.22 Clinical Faculty Appointments, should count professional activities as equivalent to scholarly activity. Examples include holding office in local, state, national, or international professional associations; membership in or appointment to local, state, national, or international committees, task forces, or work groups; and publications in professional journals, newsletters, and websites.

In an effort to be as objective and fair as possible, the FRC will use the rubric in Appendix B for determining the merit points in scholarly activity for each faculty member. Faculty members should submit the completed rubric along with their annual report.

3. Service. Psychology faculty members are expected to demonstrate behaviors that serve the Department’s positive image and are congenial in nature. When documenting a service activity, the faculty member should include a brief description of the duties performed for that activity and the hours spent during the previous calendar year in the “Comments” box. If the time commitment is not specified, the FRC and Chair will assume that the service activity is a minor one that involved only 1 hour. Up to 5 service hours tied to diversity (based on race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, veterans’ status, sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression) may count double for a maximum of 10 service hours in the “Service” category. Documentation of service effectiveness should include the following:

A. Service activities within the Department, College, or University. The Chair will send a service request to all faculty with specific departmental service activities (e.g., committee assignments, sponsorship of student organizations) that are available for the upcoming academic year. Additional activities include, but are not limited to, giving a local presentation, such as a guest lecture given to a student organization on campus. Also note that being a departmental citizen, by attending faculty meetings and other events on campus that are separate from a faculty member’s committee responsibilities (e.g., attending brown-bag lectures, attending lectures by guest speakers, attending graduation ceremonies), will be considered a service activity. Writing letters of recommendation for students will not be considered a service activity for the purposes of earning merit points.

B. Service activities to academic or professional organizations such as editorial or reviewing responsibilities (specifying the number of manuscript and/or textbook reviews completed during the previous year), leadership responsibilities, or committee responsibilities.

C. Community service activities that are related to the faculty member’s expertise or that positively promote the Department, College, or University (e.g., participating with the Department in the Walk to End Alzheimer’s).

D. Honors or recognition received for service.

E. Other documentation the faculty member wishes to submit. This other documentation and justification of additional merit should be described by the faculty member in the comment boxes and/or uploaded documents.

Per AA/PPS 04.01.20 and the Department of Psychology’s Faculty Workload Policy, service expectations differ by faculty rank, which should be considered in assigning merit ratings for this category. Changes in status during the year (e.g., change in rank, leaves of absence, employment for less than the full year, etc.) will be considered by the FRC.

*Tenured faculty* typically complete at least 50 hours of service activity per year.

*Tenure-track faculty* typically complete at least 25 hours of service activity per year.

*Senior Lecturers* typically complete at least 11 hours of service activity per year.

*Lecturers* (full-time but on only a 1-year contract) have minimal service requirements that may be met by completing at least 10 hours of service activity per year, which could be met by simply attending 10 faculty meetings that year.

*Clinical Faculty*, per AA/PPS 04.01.22 Clinical Faculty Appointments,should count practice relevant activities (performance in clinical/practice setting) equivalent to service activity.

In an effort to be as objective and fair as possible, the FRC will use the rubric in Appendix C for determining the merit points in service for each faculty member. Faculty members should submit the completed rubric along with their annual report.

##### Evaluation Period

AA/PPS. 04.01.50, Paragraph 9, specified that “faculty will be evaluated for merit purposes on the basis of accomplishments at Texas State during the identified evaluation period.” In most recent years, that period has been three years. Merit funds will be divided based on performance over the specified period. Each of the years in the identified period will be weighted equally.

##### Recommended Timeline

1. Chair notifies faculty of the annual evaluation process 1 December

and reminds them that their Annual Review Report is due February 1.

2. Faculty member submits his or her Annual Review 1 February

Report, along with copies of the previous year’s publications and any other supporting materials.

3. FRC submits performance evaluations of faculty to Chair. 15 February

 These evaluations are in the form of recommendations in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The form rates each faculty member as significantly exceeding, exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations in each of the three areas.

4. Chair reviews faculty dossiers, reviews FRC recommendations, 1 March

 completes his or her evaluations, and upon request meets briefly with faculty members to share Chair’s conclusions.